



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/569,169

02/27/2006

Markus Hame

60,469-255;5304

8609

64779

7590

05/22/2009

CARLSON GASKEY & OLDS
400 W MAPLE STE 350
BIRMINGHAM, MI 48009

EXAMINER

SINGH, KAVEL

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3651

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

05/22/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/569,169	Applicant(s) HAME ET AL.	
	Examiner KAVEL P. SINGH	Art Unit 3651	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 February 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-8,11,13-15,17-20,24,25, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kraft U.S. Patent 4,397,096 in view of Saito U.S. Patent No. 5,135,097.

Claim 1, Kraft teaches having at least one drive member (44) that follows a path around a plurality of wheels (38,58), comprising: determining whether selected wheels (38) rotate at the same speed by using the rotary encoder (35) of Saito. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill to use the monitoring device of Saito into the invention of Kraft in order to add additional safety to the conveyor.

Claim 2, Kraft does not teach as Saito teaches activating a brake (34) responsive to determining that the wheels (38 of Kraft) rotate at a different speed. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill to use a brake activation of Saito into the invention of Kraft in order to add additional safety to the conveyor.

Art Unit: 3651

Claim 3, Kraft teaches there are at least two drive members (44,46) each associated with a deflection wheel (38,58) and the method includes determining whether the deflection wheels (38,58) rotate at the same speed by using the rotary encoder (35) of Saito. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill to use the monitoring device of Saito into the invention of Kraft in order to add additional safety to the conveyor.

Claim 4, Kraft teaches there are two drive members (44,46) each associated with a drive wheel (See Fig. 1) and a deflection wheel (38,58), the drive wheels (Fig. 1) synchronously rotating, and the method includes determining whether either deflection wheel 38,58 rotates at the same speed as the drive wheels (via 35 of Saito). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill to use the monitoring device of Saito into the invention of Kraft in order to add additional safety to the conveyor.

Claim 5, Kraft teaches the member (44,46) is associated with a drive wheel (Fig. 1) and a deflection wheel (38,58) and the method includes determining whether the deflection wheel (38,58) rotates at the same speed as the drive wheel (Fig. 1) by using the rotary encoder (35) of Saito. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill to use the monitoring device of Saito into the invention of Kraft in order to add additional safety to the conveyor.

Claim 6, Kraft teaches a rotating member (part of 44) with each of the selected wheels (38,58) such that the rotating members (part of 44) rotate at the same speed as the associated wheels (38,58), and determining when at least one of the rotating members (part of 44) moves axially responsive to relative rotation between the selected wheels (38,58).

Art Unit: 3651

Claim 7, Kraft teaches a plurality of drive wheels (Fig. 1); a corresponding plurality of deflection wheels (38,58); a drive member (44,46) associated with each drive wheel (Fig. 1), each drive member (44,46) following a path around the associated drive wheel (44a,44b) and at least one corresponding deflection wheel (48a,48b); and a monitor device (35 of Saito) associated with selected ones of the wheels (38,58) that provides an indication of relative rotation between the selected wheels. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill to use the monitoring device of Saito into the invention of Kraft in order to add additional safety to the conveyor.

Claims 8,15,17,18, and 19, Kraft does not teach as Saito teaches the monitor device (35) includes a first rotating member (22) coupled to rotate with a first one of the selected wheels (38,58 of Kraft) and a second rotating member (20 of Saito) coupled to rotate with a second one of the selected wheels (38,58), the first and second rotating members (20,22 of Saito) moving relative to each other responsive to relative rotation between the selected wheels (38,58). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill to use the rotating members of Saito into the invention of Kraft in order to allow ease of rotation of the driven and deflection wheel.

Claim 11, Saito teaches one of the rotating members (20,22) is axially fixed and the other rotating member (20,22) is biased into a first axial position and wherein relative rotation between the rotating members (20,22) causes the other rotating member (20,22) to move axially against the bias. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill to use the rotating members of Saito into the invention of Kraft in order to allow ease of rotation of the driven and deflection wheel.

Art Unit: 3651

Claims 13 and 14, Saito teaches a brake actuator (34) associated with at least one of the rotating members, the actuator being operative responsive to axial movement of at least one of the rotating members (20,22). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill to use the rotating members of Saito into the invention of Kraft in order to allow ease of rotation of the driven and deflection wheel.

Claim 20, Saito teaches a first rotating member (52) for rotating at the same speed as a first selected wheel (38, 58 of Kraft); a second rotating member (56) for rotating at the same speed as a second selected wheel (38, 58 of Kraft), the first and second rotating members (52, 56) changing position relative to each other responsive to relative rotation between the wheels (44, 46).

Claim 24, Saito teaches a step chain associated with a plurality of steps (8) and wherein drive member (21) comprises a belt (20) between each drive wheel (22) and step chain (8). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill to use a step chain of Saito into the invention of Fargo to connect the driven and deflection wheel into the invention of Kraft in order to.

Claim 25, Saito teaches an indication of a condition of at least one drive member (44 of Kraft) responsive to the determining (35) (C3 L60-64).

Claim 26, Kraft does not teach as Saito teaches positioning a monitor device (35) between the selected wheels (44a,44b of Fargo) and using the monitor device for the determining .

Art Unit: 3651

Claims 9,10,12, and 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kraft U.S. Patent 4,397,096 in view of Saito U.S. Patent No. 5,135,097 in view of Reinsma U.S. Patent 3,854,345.

Claims 9,10,21, and 22, Saito teaches the first and second rotating members (20,22), but does not teach as Reinsma teaches bushings (22) having engaging faces (12) that cooperate to cause axial movement of at least one of the bushings responsive to relative rotation between the bushings (C2 L55-60). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a monitor system to use bushings to engage faces during movement as taught by Reinsma into the invention of Kraft to reduce the amount of noise produced from the system..

Claims 12 and 23, Saito teaches rotating members, does not teach as Reinsma teaches a spring (30) that biases the other rotating member (14) into the first axial position (C3 L47-50). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a monitor system to use springs to align the rotating members during movement as taught by Reinsma into the invention of Kraft to maintain the alignment and reduce wear.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ms. Kavel P. Singh whose telephone number is (571) 272-2362. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5.

Art Unit: 3651

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gene Crawford can be reached on (571) 272-6911. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

KPS

/Gene Crawford/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art
Unit 3651